



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Masayuki TAKENAKA et al.

Group Art Unit: 3632

Application No.: 10/714,642

Examiner: T. LE

Filed: November 18, 2003

Docket No.: 117215

For: VIBRATION PROOF DEVICE FOR CONTROL UNITS OF ELECTRIC DRIVE  
UNITS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the December 21, 2006 Office Action, reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 8, 11-13, 16 and 19-26 are pending.

Restriction was required and Applicants elected claims 1-5, 8, 11-13, 16, 19 and 20. With respect to non-elected claims 21-26, it is respectfully requested that they be rejoined as they are directed to the structure substantially found in Figs. 2 and 3 which is the same structure that makes up the subject matter of claim 1. Thus, claims 21-26 are drawn to the same species and should be considered.

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-13, 16, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP-A-2001-119898 (JP'898) in view of JP-A-2000-032607 (JP'607). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

JP'898 and JP'607 fail to disclose or suggest a control unit comprising a control board mounted to a base to control the drive unit, and the base is supported through the vibration proof mechanism on the drive unit, as recited in claim 1.

Page 2 of the Office Action admits that JP'898 fails to disclose a vibration proof mechanism.

JP'607 fails to overcome the deficiencies of JP'898 in suggesting a vibration proof mechanism in a control unit or using a vibration proof mechanism to support a base (from which a control board is mounted), as recited in claim 1.

JP'607's alleged buffer mechanism is a damper 2 placed between a transmission 9 and an output shaft of an engine. As used in JP'607, and as understood by one skilled in the art, a damper 2 is placed between an output shaft of an engine and a transmission in order to dampen the torque vibrations of the engine in the rotating direction. This use of a damper 2 is old and well known in the art, and as such, one skilled in the art would not incorporate the damper 2 (which is used to dampen torque vibrations in the rotating direction) in a control unit.

There is no teaching, nor is there any suggestion, to provide a damper 2 in a control unit or to support a base from which a control board is mounted, as suggested in the Office Action. Although an improved vibration resistance performance may be desired as noted in the Office Action, one skilled in the art would not look to a damper 2 in order to provide this benefit in a control unit. In addition, the Office Action fails to explain how a damper 2, which is placed between the output shaft of an engine and a transmission, could be incorporated into a control unit.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: March 19, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--